arXiv:cond-mat/9511053v1 12 Nov 1995

The Magnetic Behavior of the t-J Model

Yu-Liang Liu

International Centre for Theoretical Physics, P. O. Box 586, 34100 Trieste, Italy

Abstract

Using the spin-hole coherent state representation, and taking the long range antiferromagnetic Néel order as the background of the spin degree part, we have studied the magnetic behavior of the t-J model in the usual slave boson and slave fermion treatment of the single occupation constraint, and shown that we can qualitatively explain the anomalous magnetic and transport properties of the normal state of the cuprate superconducting materials by the t-J model.

PACS numbers: 74.20.Mn, 75.10.Jm, 75.40.Gb.

Recently, the significant progress has been made in the understanding of the low energy spin dynamics of the normal state of the cuprate superconducting materials in both theoretical[1−4] and experimental[5−7] aspects. In the undoping case, the spin dynamics of the cuprates, such as La_2CuO_4, is well described by the quantum Heisenberg model on a square lattice of Cu sites. The authors of Refs.[1,2] have extensively studied it by using the scalling and renormalization group theory and /or large-N expansion methods, and have given some valuable results which are in good agreement with the current experimental data. However, in the doped case, up to now there is not a general consensus on choosing a microscopic theory qualitatively to describe the unusually magnetic and transport properties of the normal state over the entire doping range from insulator to high doped compounds, although many models have been proposed to describe them.

The unusually physical properties of the normal state of the cuprate superconducting materials may originate from their strongly antiferromagnetic correlation. The doping will destroy the long range antiferromagnetic correlation, but the system still maintains a strongly short range antiferromagnetic correlation. In Ref. 4, we have given a detail study following this idea, and obtained some results which can qualitatively explain the unusually physical properties of the normal state. In this paper, using the similar method as in Ref. 4, we study the magnetic behavior of the

t-J model. It is well-known that the gauge theory of the t-J model[8−10] gives a better description of the transport property of the normal state, but up to now one has not known whether it can also give a reasonable description to the magnetic behavior of the normal state.

We first adopt an usual method to deal with the single occupation condition by introducing a slave fermion, so the Hamiltonian of the t-J model can be written as in a hole representation

$$\begin{aligned} H = \; & t\sum_{<ij>}(f_j^+ f_i b_{i\sigma}^+ b_{j\sigma} + h.c) \\ & + J\sum_{<ij>}(1-f_i^+ f_i)\hat{S}_i\cdot\hat{S}_j(1-f_j^+ f_j) + \sum_i \lambda_i(1-f_i^+ f_i - b_{i\sigma}^+ b_{i\sigma}) \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $\hat{S}_i = \frac{1}{2}b_{i\alpha}^+\hat{\sigma}_{\alpha\beta}b_{i\beta}$, $b_{i\sigma}$ is a hard-core boson operator which describes the spin degree of the electron, and f_i is a fermion operator which describes the charge degree of the electron. The electron operator is $c_{i\sigma} = f_i^+ b_{i\sigma}$, λ_i is a Lagrangian multiplier which ensures the single occupation condition of the electrons. In the spin-hole coherent state representation introduced by Auerbach[11]

$$|\hat{\Omega},\xi>_S \equiv |\hat{\Omega}>_S \otimes |0>_f + |\hat{\Omega}>_{S-\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \xi f^+|0>_f \tag{2}$$

where $|\hat{\Omega}>_S$ is a spin coherent state[12] and ξ is an anticommuting Grassmann vari-

able, the partition functional of the Hamiltonian (1) can be written as

$$Z = \int D\hat{\Omega} D\xi^* D\xi exp\{-\int_0^\beta [L_\Omega + L_\xi]\} \tag{3}$$

$$L_\Omega = -i \sum_i 2S\omega_i + JS^2 \sum_{<ij>} (1 - \xi_i^* \xi_i)\hat{\Omega}_i \cdot \hat{\Omega}_j (1 - \xi_j^* \xi_j) \tag{4}$$

$$L_\xi = \sum_i \xi_i^* (\partial_\tau + i\omega_i + \mu_i)\xi_i + \sqrt{2} tS \sum_{<ij>} (\xi_j^* \xi_i e^{i\gamma_{ij}} \sqrt{1 + \hat{\Omega}_i \cdot \hat{\Omega}_j} + h.c) \tag{5}$$

where the Berry phase ω is a functional of the spin order parameter $\hat{\Omega}(\tau)$. It is ambiguous modulo 4π, and its functional derivative is quite well-behaved[12]

$$\int d\tau \delta\omega = \int d\tau \hat{\Omega} \cdot (\partial_\tau \hat{\Omega} \times \delta\hat{\Omega}) \tag{6}$$

The parameter μ_i is a chemical potential of the slave fermion ξ, γ_{ij} is the phase factor of $_S < \hat{\Omega} | b_{i\sigma}^+ b_{j\sigma} | \hat{\Omega} >_S$. The Lagrangian L_ξ is invariant under following gauge transformations

$$\xi_i \to \xi_i e^{i\theta_i}, \;\; \gamma_{ij} \to \gamma_{ij} - \theta_i + \theta_j, \;\; \mu_i \to \mu_i + i\partial_\tau \theta_i \tag{7}$$

which derives from the slave fermion representation of the electron operator $c_{i\sigma} = f_i^+ b_{i\sigma}$. The single occupation condition in (1) disappears in (4) and (5), because in the spin-hole coherent state representation the term $(1 - f_i^+ f_i - b_{i\sigma}^+ b_{i\sigma})$ is equal to zero at each site. From the equations (4) and (5), we see that the Lagrangian

L_Ω dominates the antiferromagnetic behavior of the system, then the Lagrangian L_ξ dominates the ferromagnetic behavior (or destroys the antiferromagnetic behavior) of the system because the factor $\sqrt{1+\hat{\Omega}_i \cdot \hat{\Omega}_j}$ is zero for antiferromagnetic order and is biggest for ferromagnetic order. According to the current experimental data of the cuprate superconducting materials, almost all of them show a strongly short range antiferromagnetic behavior in the normal state, even in the superconducting state, the short range antiferromagnetic behavior also appears. Therefore, according to this fact, we take a long range antiferromagnetic Néel order as a background of the spin order parameter

$$\hbar S\hat{\Omega}_i \simeq \hbar\eta_i\hat{\Omega}(x_i) + a^2\hat{L}(x_i) \tag{8}$$

where a^2 is the unit cell volume, $\hat{\Omega}(x_i)$ is the slowly varying Néel unit vector order, i.e., spin parameter field $|\hat{\Omega}(x_i)| = 1$, and $\hat{L}(x_i)$ is the slowly varying magnetization density field, $\hat{\Omega}(x_i) \cdot \hat{L}(x_i) = 0$. The Berry phase term may be separated into two parts

$$S\sum_i \omega_i \simeq S\sum_i \eta_i\omega(x_i) + \frac{1}{\hbar}\int d^2x\hat{\Omega} \cdot (\frac{\partial\hat{\Omega}}{\partial\tau} \times \hat{L}) \tag{9}$$

where $\omega(x)$ is the solid angle subtended on the unit sphere by the closed curve $\hat{\Omega}(x,\tau)$ (parametrized by τ). Because of in the long range antiferromagnetic Néel order approximation, the electron hoping must be accompanied with a $\pi - phase$ rotation

in spin space to match with the nextest neighbor spin orientations, so the t-term in (1) must be changed as

$$\begin{aligned} f_i^+ f_j b_{j\sigma}^+ b_{i\sigma} = & \; e^{-2i\sum\limits_{l\neq i,j}\theta_{ij}(l)S_l^z} f_i^+ f_j e^{2i\sum\limits_{l\neq i,j}\theta_{ij}(l)S_l^z} b_{j\sigma}^+ b_{i\sigma} \\ = & \; e^{-2i\sum\limits_{l\neq i,j}\theta_{ij}(l)S_l^z} f_i^+ f_j \tilde{b}_{j\sigma}^+ \tilde{b}_{i\sigma} \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where $\theta_{ij}(l) = \theta_i(l) - \theta_j(l)$, $\theta_i(l)$ is an angle between the direction from site i to site l and some fixed direction, the x axis for example; $S_l^z = \frac{1}{2} b_{l\alpha}^+ \sigma_{\alpha\beta}^z b_{l\beta}$, the z-component of the spin operator; $\tilde{b}_{i\sigma} = e^{2i\sum_{l\neq i}\theta_i(l)S_l^z} b_{i\sigma}$, is a fermion operator. Under the approximations (8) and (9), and eliminated the magnetization density field $\hat{L}(x)$, the Lagrangians in (4) and (5) can be written as, respectively

$$L_\Omega = \frac{1}{2g_0}\int d^2x[(\vec{\partial}\hat{\Omega})^2 + \frac{1}{c^2}(\partial_\tau\hat{\Omega})^2] \tag{11}$$

$$\begin{aligned} L_\xi = & \; \sum_i \xi_i^*(\partial_\tau - \mu_i)\xi_i \\ + & \; \sqrt{2}tS\sum_{<ij>}\{\xi_j^*\xi_i e^{i\gamma_{ij}'}[1 + \eta_i\eta_j\hat{\Omega}(x_i)\hat{\Omega}(x_j)]^{\frac{1}{2}} + h.c\} \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where $\gamma_{ij}' = \gamma_{ij} + \sum\limits_{l\neq i,j}\theta_{ij}(l)_S < \hat{\Omega}|(b_{l\uparrow}^+ b_{l\uparrow} - b_{l\downarrow}^+ b_{l\downarrow})|\hat{\Omega} >_S$, $g_0 = (J(1-\delta)^2S^2)^{-1}$, $c^2 = 8(aJ(1-\delta)S)^2$. For the J-term in (4), we have replaced the $f_i^+ f_i$ and $f_j^+ f_j$ by $\delta =< f_i^+ f_i >=< f_j^+ f_j >$, the doping density. We have omitted the terms $\sum_i \eta_i\omega(x_i)$ and $\sum_i \eta_i\omega(x_i)\xi_i^*\xi_i$. If $\omega(x)$ is a slowly varying function of space coordinates $\vec{x}$ and "time" τ and the occupation number of the quasiparticle ξ is equal at the even and

odd sites, these two terms have a little contribution to the system. However, the quantity $\omega(x)$ provides an attractive interaction between the fermions ξ_i and $\xi_{i+\hat{\delta}}$, $\hat{\delta} = (\pm a, \pm a)$, at the even and odd sites, respectively, which may induce the pairing between the slave fermions at the even and odd sites. Here we assume this effect is very small, and do not consider it, or we only consider the normal state of the system.

Taking the Hartree approximation, the Lagrangian (12) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} L_\xi = & \sum_i \xi_i^*(\partial_\tau - \mu_i)\xi_i + tS\sum_{<ij>}\{\Delta_{ij}\xi_j^*\xi_i \\ + & \Lambda_{ij}\xi_j^*\xi_i[(\hat{\Omega}(x_i) - \hat{\Omega}(x_j))^2]^{1/2} + \Gamma_{ij}e^{i\gamma_{ij}^{'}} + h.c\} \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where $\Delta_{ij} =< [(\hat{\Omega}(x_i) - \hat{\Omega}(x_j)^2]^{1/2}e^{i\gamma_{ij}^{'}} >$, $\Lambda_{ij} =< e^{i\gamma_{ij}^{'}} >$, $\Gamma_{ij} =< \xi_j^*\xi_i[(\hat{\Omega}(x_i) - \hat{\Omega}(x_j))^2]^{1/2}$. The Δ_{ij} term is the kinetic term of the slave fermion ξ, the Λ_{ij} term is the interaction term between the slave fermion ξ and the spin parameter field $\hat{\Omega}(x)$, the Γ_{ij} term is a gauge field Maxwell-like term which provides a background gauge current to maintain the system being neutral to the native gauge field deriving from the slave fermion representation of the electron (see below). To retain the gauge invariance of the Lagrangian (13) under the gauge transformations in (7), we can take following approximations

$$\Delta_{ij} = \Delta e^{i\theta_{ij}}, \;\; \Lambda_{ij} = \Lambda e^{i\theta_{ij}}, \;\; \Gamma_{ij} = \Gamma e^{-i\theta_{ij}} \tag{14}$$

where $\theta_{ij} = (\vec{x}_i - \vec{x}_j)\cdot\vec{A}(\frac{x_i - x_j}{2})$. In the continuous limit, the Lagrangian (13) can be

written as

$$\begin{aligned} L_\xi = & \int d^2x[\xi^*(\partial_\tau - iA_0)\xi + \tfrac{1}{2m}\xi^*(\vec{\partial} - i\vec{A})^2\xi \\ + & V\xi^*\xi|\vec{\partial}\hat{\Omega}| + \alpha F[a+A]] \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where $m = (2tS\Delta)^{-1}$, $V = 2tS\Lambda/a$, $\alpha = 2tS\Gamma$, $\mu_i = iA_0$, $|\vec{\partial}\hat{\Omega}| \equiv |(\partial_x\hat{\Omega})^2|^{1/2} + |(\partial_y\hat{\Omega})^2|^{1/2}$, $(\vec{x}_i - \vec{x}_j)\cdot\vec{a}(\frac{x_i - x_j}{2}) \simeq -\gamma_{ij} - \sum_{l\neq i,j}\theta_{ij}(l)_S < \hat{\Omega}|b^+_{l\uparrow}b_{l\uparrow} - b^+_{l\downarrow}b_{l\downarrow}|\hat{\Omega} >_S$, $\vec{a}$ is a gauge field deriving from the spin fluctuation. In the first order approximation, we can take $F[A]$ as $F[A] = F^2_{ij}[a]$, $F_{ij}[A] = \partial_i A_j - \partial_j A_i$. From the equation (15), we have the neutral condition of the system

$$-\vec{j}_\xi + \alpha\frac{\delta F[a+A]}{\delta\vec{A}} = 0 \tag{16}$$

The term $\alpha F[a+A]$ in (15) is similar to the gauge fluctuation term obtained by integrating out the spin degree $b_{i\sigma}$ in the ordinary slave fermion method of the t-J model.

We can also adopt the slave boson method to deal with the t-J model. In the long range antiferromagnetic Néel order approximation, to match with the nextest neighbor spin orientations, the t-term can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} b^+_j b_i f^+_{i\sigma} f_{j\sigma} = & \; e^{-2i\sum\limits_{l\neq i,j}\theta_{ij}(l)S^z_l} b^+_j b_i e^{2i\sum\limits_{l\neq i,j}\theta_{ij}(l)S^z_l} f^+_{i\sigma} f_{j\sigma} \\ = & \; e^{-2i\sum\limits_{l\neq i,j}\theta_{ij}(l)S^z_l} e^{-i\sum\limits_{l\neq i,j}\theta'_{ij}(l)b^+_l b_l} \tilde{b}^+_j\tilde{b}_i\tilde{f}^+_{i\sigma}\tilde{f}_{j\sigma} \end{aligned}$$

where, $S_l^z = \frac{1}{2} f_{l\alpha}^+ \sigma_{\alpha\beta}^z f_{l\beta}$, $\tilde{f}_{i\sigma} = e^{-2i\sum\limits_{l\neq i}\theta_i(l)S_l^z} f_{i\sigma}$ is a hard-core boson; $\tilde{b}_i = e^{i\sum\limits_{l\neq i}\theta_i'(l)b_l^+ b_l} b_i$ is a fermion; because of in the slave boson representation, the electron operator reads $c_{i\sigma} = b_i^+ f_{i\sigma}$, b_i is a slave (hard-core) boson, $f_{i\sigma}$ is a fermion. In order to use the spin-hole coherent state representation, we have changed the slave boson into a fermion. After finished the calculation, we can change the fermion $\tilde{b}_i$ into the slave boson b_i, so we can obtain following Lagrangian similar to that in (15)

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\bar{\xi}} = & \int d^2x[\bar{\xi}^*(\partial_\tau - iA_0)\bar{\xi} + \tfrac{1}{2m'}\bar{\xi}^*(\vec{\partial} - i\vec{A})^2\bar{\xi} \\ + & V'\bar{\xi}^*\bar{\xi}|\vec{\partial}\hat{\Omega}| + \alpha' F[a' + A]] \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where $(\vec{x}_i - \vec{x}_j)\cdot\vec{a}' = -\bar{\gamma}_{ij} - \sum\limits_{l\neq i,j}\theta_{ij}(l)_S < \hat{\Omega}|\tilde{f}_{l\uparrow}^+\tilde{f}_{l\uparrow} - \tilde{f}_{l\downarrow}^+\tilde{f}_{l\downarrow}|\hat{\Omega} >_S$, $\bar{\gamma}_{ij}$ is the phase factor of $_S < \hat{\Omega}|\tilde{f}_{i\sigma}^+\tilde{f}_{j\sigma}|\hat{\Omega} >_S$, $\bar{\xi}$ is a hard-core boson field.

If we integrate out the slave fermion ξ, we can obtain following effective actions of the gauge field and the spin parameter field

$$S_{eff.} = S_{eff.}^{\xi}[A] + S_{eff.}^{\xi}[\Omega] \tag{18}$$

$$\begin{aligned} S_{eff.}^{\xi}[A] = & \int\frac{d\omega}{2\pi}\int\frac{d^2q}{(2\pi)^2}(\chi_F q^2 - \frac{i\omega}{v_F q})(\delta_{ij} - \frac{q_i q_j}{q^2})A_i(q,\omega)A_j(-q,-\omega) \\ + & \int d\tau\int d^2x\alpha F[a + A] \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

$$S_{eff.}^{\xi}[\Omega] = -\beta\sum_n\int\frac{d^2q}{(2\pi)^2}\frac{|\omega_n|}{\omega_F}|\hat{\Omega}|^2(q,\omega_n) \tag{20}$$

where χ_F is the diamagnetic susceptibility of the slave fermion system, and v_F is the Fermi velocity of the slave fermion, $\omega_F \propto \frac{1}{V^2 k_F}$, a character energy scale which describes the damping of the quasiparticle-hole pairing excitation to the spin wave spectrum. We have omitted the crossover terms between the gauge field $\vec{A}$ and the spin parameter field $\hat{\Omega}$ that are higher order terms, and the higher order derivatives of the spin parameter field $\hat{\Omega}$. We must be careful in dealing with the Lagrangian (17), because as we integrate out the hard-core boson field $\bar{\xi}$, we meet with a problem of the condensation of the hard-core boson, only as the temperature $T > T_0$, the condensation temperature of the hard-core boson, we can obtain an effective action similar to that in equations (19) and (20). The condensation of the hard-core boson will destroy the gauge invariance of the native gauge field $\vec{A}$. Mathematically, the Lagrangians in (15) and (17) are equivalent, so we think that the quantum gauge fluctuation can drastically suppress the condensation of the hard-core bosons, if there is not another interaction source, the condensation temperature tends to zero, $T_0 = 0$.

From equations (11) and (20), we obtain an effective action of the spin parameter field of the t-J model

$$S_{eff.}[\Omega] = \beta \sum_n \int \frac{d^2q}{(2\pi)^2} \{ \frac{1}{2g_0}(q^2 + \frac{1}{c^2}\omega_n^2) - \frac{|\omega_n|}{\omega_F} \} |\Omega|^2(q, \omega_n) \tag{21}$$

where $|\Omega(x,\tau)| = 1$, the origin points of q are in the corner points $\vec{Q} = (\pm\frac{\pi}{a}, \pm\frac{\pi}{a})$. The

action (21), our central result in this paper, is the same as that in Ref.4 we obtained from a p-d model or an effective Hamiltonian derived from a three-band Hubbard model. This action has two critical regions: one is a $z = 1$ (where z is a dynamic exponent) region which is consisted of three regimes: a renormalized classical (RC) regime, a quantum critical (QC) regime and a quantum disorder (QD) regime[1]; another one is a $z = 2$ region which maybe is also divided into the same two (QC and QD) regimes as above, but their behavior is completely different from that in the $z = 1$ region. In the undoping case, $\omega_F \to \infty$, the system is in the RC regime[1,2]. In the underdoping case, $\omega_c < \omega_F < \infty$, the system is in the $z = 1$ QC and/or QD regimes[3,4]. In the optimal doping case, $\omega_F < \omega_c$, the system goes into the $z = 2$ region[3,4]. ω_c is a characteristic energy scale which indicases a crossover of the system from the $z = 1$ region to the $z = 2$ region as doping. We see that the ω_F term in (21) which derives from the damping of the quasiparticle-hole pairing excitation to the spin wave spectrum is very important for determining the doping influence on the system, especially in the optimal doping case, this term is dominant.

Generally, in the $z = 1$ region, the ω_F term is very small, and can be treated perturbatively, in the low energy limit we can obtain following spin susceptibility

$$\chi(q,\omega) = \frac{\chi_0}{\xi^{-2} + q^2 - \frac{1}{c^2}\omega^2 - \frac{i\omega}{\omega_F^R}} \tag{22}$$

where ξ is a coherent length, ω_F^R is a renormalized characteristic energy scale of the spin fluctuation. In the $(z = 1)$ QC regime[4], $\xi \sim \frac{1}{T}, \omega_F^R \sim \frac{1}{T}$; In the $(z = 1)$ QD regime, ξ and ω_F^R take constants. In the $z = 2$ region, the ω_F term is dominant, the ω^2 term is irrelevant and can be omitted, in the low energy limit we can obtain following spin susceptibility

$$\bar{\chi}(q,\omega) = \frac{\bar{\chi}_0}{\bar{\xi}^{-2} + q^2 - \frac{i\omega}{\bar{\omega}_F}} \tag{23}$$

where $\bar{\omega}_F = \frac{\omega_F}{2g_0}$ is a renormalization group invariant quantity. In the $(z = 2)$ QC regime[4], $\bar{\xi}^2 \sim \frac{1}{T}$. Using these spin susceptibilities in (22) and (23), we can betterly explain the current experimental data[5−7] of the nuclear magnetic resonance spin-lattice relaxation rate and the spin echo decay rate about the copper spin. However, in the t-J model the spin degree of the oxygen is completely suppressed, we cannot give a reasonable explanation to the magnetic behavior of the oxygen spin only from the t-J model.

The transport behavior of the normal state is determined by the Lagrangian (15) or (17). The gauge field $\vec{a}$ (or $\vec{a}'$) has a drastically influence on the charge degree part because of the single occupation condition of the electrons meaning a strong correlation between the charge and spin degrees. In the mean field theory approximation, if we use the hard-core boson to describe the charge degree part

of the system, the hard-core boson will move in a zero background magnetic field deriving from the spin degree part if the phase factor $\bar{\gamma}_{ij}$ gives a zero contribution

$$\vec{\partial} \cdot \vec{a}' = 2\pi < \tilde{f}_{\uparrow}^{+} \tilde{f}_{\uparrow} - \tilde{f}_{\downarrow}^{+} \tilde{f}_{\downarrow} >= 0 \tag{24}$$

where we take $< \tilde{f}_{\uparrow}^{+} \tilde{f}_{\uparrow} >=< \tilde{f}_{\downarrow}^{+} \tilde{f}_{\downarrow} >$. If the phase factor $\bar{\gamma}_{ij}$ gives a non-zero contribution to this background magnetic field, the system has not a parity-symmetry in the mean field theory approximation. If we use the slave fermion to describe the charge degree part, in the mean field theory approximation the slave fermion also moves in a zero background magnetic field deriving from the spin degree part if the phase factor γ_{ij} gives a zero contribution

$$\vec{\partial} \cdot \vec{a} = 2\pi < b_{\uparrow}^{+} b_{\uparrow} - b_{\downarrow}^{+} b_{\downarrow} >= 0 \tag{25}$$

where we take $< b_{\uparrow}^{+} b_{\uparrow} >=< b_{\downarrow}^{+} b_{\downarrow} >$. Therefore, the influence of the gauge field $\vec{a}$ (or $\vec{a}'$) on the charge degree comes from the high order quantum fluctuation of the spin degree part. However, there maybe exists a common background magnetic field deriving from the spin degree part whether we use the hard-core boson or the slave fermion to describe the charge degree part because of the appearance of the phase factor γ_{ij} (or $\bar{\gamma}_{ij}$). On the other hand, because of the single occupation condition, there exists a strong correlation betwwen the spin and charge parts, the mean field theory approximation is not accurate. We think that the Lagrangians (15) and (17)

are equivalent, we can use one of them to describe the transport behavior of the normal state of the cuprate superconducting materials. If we use the Lagrangian (17) to describe the transport behavior of the system, the resistivity produced by the quasiparticle-gauge fluctuation scattering[9] is $\rho \sim T$ in the high temperature region. While in the low temperature region, the hard-core nature of the slave boson is dominant, which derives from the single occupation condition, so we should first change the slave boson into a fermion which naturally obeys the single occupation constraint, then we can calculate the transport property of the system, or we use the Lagrangian (15) to calculate the transport behavior of the system. If the phase factor γ_{ij} gives a zero background magnetic field, we can obtain the temperature dependence of the resistivity induced by the quasiparticle-gauge fluctuation scattering[9] $\rho \sim T^{4/3}$. In the underdoping case, the current experimental data shows that in the lower teperature region the resistivity is $\rho \sim T^{\alpha}$, $1 < \alpha < 2$, in the higher teperature region the resistivity is $\rho \sim T$. In the optimal doping case, the resistivity is $\rho \sim T$ for $T > T_c$. Therefore, using the Lagrangians (15) and (17), we can qualitatively explain the temperature dependence of the resistivity. Because of the appearance of the gauge field $\vec{a}$ (or $\vec{a}^{'}$), the high order quantum fluctuation of the spin degree part gives an effective magnetic field $B = \vec{\partial} \cdot \vec{a}$ (ro $B^{'} = \vec{\partial} \cdot \vec{a}^{'}$), which will destroy the parity-symmetry of the system, and may provide an odd-parity gauge interaction

$D_{j0}(q,\omega) =< A_j(q,\omega)A_0(-q,-\omega) >= \sigma\varepsilon_{jk}q_kF(q^2,\omega)$, introduced by the authors in Ref.13. Using this interaction, we can qualitatively explain the unusual temperature dependence of the Hall coefficient[4,13].

In conclusion, using the spin-hole coherent state representation, we have studied the normal state property of the t-J model in the usual slave boson and slave fermion treatment of the single occupation constraint, and shown that we can qualitatively explain the unusually magnetic and transport behaviors of the normal state of the cuprate superconducting materials by the t-J model. We think that the short range antiferromagnetic correlation induces the unusual behavior of the normal state of the cuprate materials, so it is a reasonable approximation that we take a long range antiferromagnetic Néel order as a background of the spin degree part of the system, the coupling between the charge degree and spin degree will destroy this long range order, but the system still has the short range antiferromagnetic order. In the undoping case, the system can be described by a non-linear σ-model (the t-J model reduces to the Heisenberg model). In the doping case, the coupling between the charge degree and spin degree provides a decay term to the non-linear σ-model, which describes the damping of the quasiparticle-hole pairing excitation to the spin wave spectrum. Using this effective Lagrangian (11), we can betterly explain the unusually magnetic behavior of the normal state of the cuprate superconducting materials. However,

there exist two Lagrangians (15) and (17) to the charge degree part of the system, we think that they are equivalent to each other. Using them we can qualitatively explain the transport behavior of the normal state of the cuprate superconducting materials, the temperature dependence of the resistivity is mainly determined by the quasiparticle-gauge fluctuation scattering.

The author is particularly thankful to Prof. L. Yu and Prof. Z. B. Su for their encouragement.

References

1 S.Chakravarty, B.I.Halperin, and D.R.Nelson, Phys. Rev. **B**39, 2344(1989); S.Chakravarty, and R.Orbach, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 224(1990).

2 S.Sachdev, and J.Ye, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2411(1992); A.V.Chubukov, and S.Sachdev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 169(1993); A.V.Chubukov, S.Sachdev, and J.Ye, Phys. Rev. **B**49, 11919(1994).

3 A.Millis, H.Monien, and D.Pines, Phys. Rev. **B**42, 167(1990); T.Moriya, Y.Takahashi, and K.Ueda, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **59**, 2905(1990); H.Monien, P.Monthoux, and D.Pines, Phys. Rev. **B**43, 275(1991); A.Sokol, and D.Pines, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 2813(1993).

4 Y.L.Liu, and Z.B.Su, Phys. Lett. **A**200, 393(1995); Y.L.Liu, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **7**, 3749(1995); Theory of the normal state of the cuprate superconducting materials, cond-mat/9510015.

5 C.H.Pennington, and C.P.Slichter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 381(1991); T.Imai, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **B**47, 9158(1993); Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1002(1993); *ibid.* **71**, 1254(1993).

6 J.Rossat-Mignod, *et al.*, Physica (Amsterdam) 185-189C, 86(1991); P.M.Gehring, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **B**44, 2811(1991).

7 M.Takigawa, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **B**43, 247(1991); M.Takigawa, *ibid.* **B**49, 4158(1994).

8 L.Ioffe, and A.Larkin, Phys. Rev. **B**39, 8988(1989); P.A.Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 6801(1989).

9 N.Nagaosa, and P.A.Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 2450(1990); Phys. Rev. **B**43, 1223(1991); **B**43, 1234(1991).

10 L.Ioffe, and P.W.Wiegmann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 653(1990); L.B.Ioffe, and G.Kotliar, Phys. Rev. **B**42, 10348(1990).

11 A.Auerbach, *Interacting Electrons and Quantum Magnetism*, (Spinger-Verlag, 1994).

12 F.D.M.Haldane, *Two-Dimensional Strongly Correlated Electronic System*, Eds. Z.Z.Gan and Z.B.Su, (Gorden and Breach, 1988), pp.249-261; Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 1029(1988).

13 L.B.Ioffe, V.Kalmeyer, and P.B.Wiegmann, Phys. Rev. **B**43, 1219(1991).